EXHIBIT A

1	BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP	SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1	David Boies (admitted pro hac vice)	Bill Carmody (admitted pro hac vice)
2	333 Main Street	Shawn J. Rabin (admitted pro hac vice)
2	Armonk, NY 10504	Steven M. Shepard (admitted pro hac vice)
3	Tel: (914) 749-8200 dboies@bsfllp.com	Alexander Frawley (admitted pro hac vice) 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
4	<u> </u>	New York, NY 10019
_	Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165	Tel.: (212) 336-8330
5	Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No. 238027	bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
6	Erika Nyborg-Burch, CA Bar No. 342125	srabin@susmangodfrey.com
_	44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor	sshepard@susmangodfrey.com
7	San Francisco, CA 94104	afrawley@susmangodfrey.com
8	Tel.: (415) 293-6800	Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891
	mmao@bsfllp.com	1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
9	brichardson@bsfllp.com	Los Angeles, CA 90067
10	enyborg-burch@bsfllp.com	Tel.: (310) 789-3100
	James Lee (admitted pro hac vice)	abonn@susmangodfrey.com
11	Rossana Baeza (admitted pro hac vice)	MORGAN & MORGAN
12	100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor	John A. Yanchunis (admitted pro hac vice)
	Miami, FL 33131 Tel.: (305) 539-8400	Ryan J. McGee (admitted pro hac vice) 201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor
13	jlee@bsfllp.com	Tampa, FL 33602
14	rbaeza@bsfllp.com	Tel.: (813) 223-5505
		jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
15	Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334 725 S Figueroa St., 31st Floor	rmcgee@forthepeople.com
16	Los Angeles, CA 90017	Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805
10	Tel.: (213) 995-5720	711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500
17	alanderson@bsfllp.com	San Francisco, CA 94102
18		Tel: (415) 358-6913
10		mram@forthepeople.com
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
20	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
21	CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,	Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK
22	JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO	PLAINTIFFS' [PROPOSED] SUR-REPLY
	individually and on behalf of all other similarly	IN OPPOSITION TO GOOGLE'S
23	situated,	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
24	,	Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
27	Plaintiffs,	Hearing Date: May 12, 2023
25	v.	Time: 1:00 p.m.
26	GOOGLE LLC,	Location: Courtroom 1 – 4th Floor
20	Defendant.	
27		
28	Plaintiffs' [Pro	posed] Surreply in Opposition to Google's MSJ Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

Plaintiffs' [Proposed] Surreply in Opposition to Google's MSJ Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK Sensing defeat, Google's summary judgment reply brief desperately adds a new argument related to Plaintiffs' CDAFA claim. Google claims that the "CDAFA requires that the defendant circumvent[] technical or code-based barriers, or otherwise render ineffective any barriers . . . to prevent access," and Google argues that Plaintiffs cannot meet this standard. Dkt. 934 at 13.

Courts have rejected this interpretation of the CDAFA. In 2015, the Ninth Circuit clarified that, unlike the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, the CDAFA "does not require unauthorized access. It merely requires knowing access." *United States v. Christensen*, 828 F.3d 763, 789 (9th Cir. 2015). The "term 'access' as defined in the [CDAFA] includes logging into a database with a valid password and subsequently taking, copying, or using the information in the database improperly." *Id.* In light of *Christensen*, numerous courts have rejected Google's contention that technical circumvention is required. *See, e.g., Henry Schein, Inc. v. Cook*, 2017 WL 783617, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2017) (explaining how the Ninth Circuit in *Christensen* resolved "a split of authority" over whether technical circumvention is required, and held it was not); *Rodriguez v. Google*, 2021 WL 2026726, at *7 (N.D. Cal. May 21, 2021) (similar).

Rodriguez is instructive. Google likewise argued that "a party only acts 'without permission' when it 'circumvents technical or code-based barriers in place to restrict or bar a user's access." Id. at *7. The court disagreed: "the Ninth Circuit repeatedly has emphasized that '[a] plain reading of the statute demonstrates that its focus is on the unauthorized taking or use of information." Id. (emphasis added) (quoting Christensen, 828 F.3d at 789). Plaintiffs need only demonstrate "Google's knowing access to, and unpermitted taking of, plaintiffs' [] data." Id. Here, whether Google had permission to access Plaintiffs' private browsing data is a triable issue of fact because a jury could find that Google did not obtain their consent to collect this data. See also In re Carrier IQ, Inc., 78 F. Supp. 3d 1051, 1101 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (even before Christensen, casting doubt on the technical-circumvention standard, reasoning that to "hold[] that a defendant acts with 'permission' for purposes of the CCDFA any time it does not need to overcome 'technical or code based barriers in place to restrict or bar a user's access' leads to

results which strain the plain and ordinary meaning of the term 'permission'"). 1 But even if the Court were to overlook *Christensen*, there would still be a triable issue of 2 fact because Plaintiffs have uncovered evidence demonstrating there is no way to prevent 3 Google's collection of private browsing data. Dkt. 933-3 (SUF 79). This evidence includes 4 Plaintiffs' expert's analysis as well as admissions from Google employees and experts. For 5 example, when asked how to prevent "Google from logging their Incognito activity" on 6 7 "Google's servers," former employee Rory McClelland admitted "there is no way that users 8 *can prevent that.*" Mao Ex. 20 at 318:3-12 (emphasis added). Such evidence raises a triable issue 9 of fact even under Google's (legally incorrect) standard because Plaintiffs "had no way to remove the [Google tracking beacons] or to opt-out of [their] functionality." In re Carrier IQ, Inc., 78 F. 10 Supp. 3d at 1101. "That is sufficient" under Google's proposed test. *Id*. 11 12 Dated: April 28, 2023 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP 13 By /s/ Mark Mao 14 Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165) mmao@bsfllp.com 15 Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027) 16 brichardson@bsfllp.com Erika Nyborg-Burch (CA Bar No. 342125) 17 enyborg-burch@bsfllp.com 18 **BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP** 44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor 19 San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 293 6858 20 Facsimile (415) 999 9695 21 David Boies (admitted pro hac vice) dboies@bsfllp.com 22 **BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP** 23 333 Main Street Armonk, NY 10504 24 Telephone: (914) 749-8200 Facsimile: (914) 749-8300 25 James W. Lee (pro hac vice) 26 jlee@bsfllp.com 27 Plaintiffs' [Proposed] Surreply in Opposition to Google's MSJ

Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

28

l	
1	Rossana Baeza (<i>pro hac vice</i>) rbaeza@bsfllp.com BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
2	100 SE 2 nd Street, Suite 2800
3	Miami, FL 33130 Telephone: (305) 539-8400 Facsimile: (305) 539-1304
4	Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)
5 6	SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P. 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
	Los Angeles, CA 90067
7	Telephone: (310) 789-3100
8	Bill Carmody (<i>pro hac vice</i>) bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
9	Shawn J. Rabin (<i>pro hac vice</i>) srabin@susmangodfrey.com
10	Steven Shepard (pro hac vice)
11	sshepard@susmangodfrey.com Alexander P. Frawley (<i>pro hac vice</i>)
12	afrawley@susmangodfrey.com SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
13	1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32 nd Floor
14	New York, NY 10019 Telephone: (212) 336-8330
15	John A. Yanchunis (pro hac vice)
16	jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
17	Ryan J. McGee (pro hac vice) rmcgee@forthepeople.com
18	MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.
19	201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor Tampa, FL 33602
20	Telephone: (813) 223-5505 Facsimile: (813) 222-4736
21	
22	Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805 MORGAN & MORGAN
23	711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500 San Francisco, CA 94102
24	Tel: (415) 358-6913
	mram@forthepeople.com
25	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
26	
27	Plaintiffs' [Proposed] Surrenly in Opposition to Google's MSI
	Plaintiffs' [Proposed] Surreply in Opposition to Google's MSJ Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK